

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,717	NEOFOTISTOS, PARIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew O. Savage	1724	

All Participants:

(1) Matthew O. Savage.

(2) Mr. T. Daniel Christenbury.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 April 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, and 11-14

Prior art documents discussed:

Wekhof and Veloz, of record.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend claims 1 and 11 to patently distinguish over Wekhof and Veloz, all limitations having basis in FIGS. 7 and 9 of the original drawing Figures. Agreed to cancel claims 12-14 of which were considered redundant of claims 4, 2, and 7, respectively. See the attached examiner's amendment and reasons for allowance for details..